

TSE-0010 (contd); TSE-0011

1 waste that's already there, not add to it.
2 Thanks.

3 MR. DEE WILLIS: Charles
4 Weems.

5 **TSE-0011** DR. CHARLES WEEMS: Thank you.
6 I am Charles Weems. I am a member of the
7 Washington Physicians for Social
8 Responsibility.

1
9 I notice that there has been a
10 significant tone of the discussion, alteration
11 in the last few months, and it seems to me that
12 we get the impression that the administration
13 is moving by fiat.

14 This seems to be that this fiat is
15 on the fallacy of the accelerated plan, which
16 is to use a whole lot less money and do things
17 quicker.

2
18 Now, the impression is also that of
19 a certain amount of arrogance, and I think that
20 these recent activities, such as not allowing
21 an adequate amount of time for the analysis of
22 this EIS, is part of it.

23 And there have been a number of
24 things that would suggest that there is an
25 arrogant stand on the part of the Department of

TSE-0011 (contd)

1 Energy. And I don't want in any way to have
2 you personally feel that this is being directed
3 at you. I admire your ability to take the
4 shots, as it were.

5 But I think that there is a moral
6 imperative on the part of the leaders at
7 Richland to let the administration know what
8 the reality is, and what it is that the
9 citizens of Washington and Oregon really think
10 about this area.

11 Hanford was not originally designed
12 as a waste area. We have two other waste
13 areas, Yucca Mountain, and the WIPP in New
3 14 Mexico, which are actually designed as
15 geologically safe areas to put waste.

16 Hanford has in no way been designed
17 for the placement of waste. So it's a
18 secondary type of thing. And I think that it
19 has become perfectly clear that the citizens of
20 this area feel very strongly about the
4 21 groundwater. It's been talked about for a
22 number of years. And there seems to be a
23 continued failure on the part of the Department
24 of Energy to address the groundwater.

5 25 The scope of this EIS is extremely

TSE-0011 (contd)

5

1 narrow. And as a result, it makes little tiny
2 packages out of a huge problem.

3 But it also allows the DOE to avoid
4 any analysis of what the whole accumulative
5 effect of all this waste is.

6 So we never get a sense of
7 cumulative waste.

8 I would draw your attention to
9 something that you did say in your presentation
10 about an analysis, and you talked about a huge
11 amount of material being analyzed.

12 The problem with that, and I hope
13 everybody understands, it is a jargon, they
14 have analyzed, meaning they have discussed the
15 placement of waste in the ground. They haven't
16 analyzed any of the waste in the ground.

6

17 So that which we think of as an
18 analysis, that is, knowing what is actually in
19 the ground, as waste, and as contaminants, has
20 not been analyzed.

21 There are a lot of things that have
22 been brought up, and I would just simply add,
23 or place a couple of points.

24 A recent publication by the National
25 Academies of Science has recommended in direct

50

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TSE-0011 (contd)

1 statement about Hanford wastes, they state that
2 there should be retrievability and it should be
3 contained.

4 Well, clearly containment is not a
5 problem. Or I shouldn't say it is not a
6 problem. It's not a problem they have
7 addressed. What they are trying to do is
8 contain the public by putting up institutional
9 controls that will fail to have the public get
10 to an area which is massively contaminated. It
11 is not being contained.

12 Secondly, it's not going to be
13 retrievable in the form that it's being
14 currently put.

15 So I would suggest that this EIS, as
16 have the previous speakers, I would suggest
17 that it be put in abeyance, and that at such
18 time as the current waste can be both analyzed
19 in a proper manner and cared for properly, then
20 it could be reinstituted.

21 Thank you.

22 MR. DEE WILLIS: Gerry Pollet.

23 MR. GERRY POLLET: Why don't
24 you have someone else. I have given -- I will
25 come back and give more testimony after other

TSE-0012

1 people have a chance.

2 MR. DEE WILLIS: Bob A-e-g --

3 **TSE-0012** MR. BOB AEGORTOR: That's fine.

4 I am Bob Aegortor, retired environmental
5 facilities planner, and a grandfather. I wish
6 I had three other grandfathers here standing
7 with me.

8 Thank you for this opportunity to
9 comment. Much, much earlier in my career, all
10 the questions like this would have gotten an
11 individual is a comment in his FBI file.

12 The EIS must be amended to address
13 cumulative impacts of burial of hazardous
14 wastes, past, present and future.

15 The groundwater contamination levels
16 must be stated at the boundary levels of the
17 containers, the sites. It's the only thing
18 that makes sense, and it's the only thing that
19 truly can be subject to analysis.

20 For the low-level waste, as well as
21 all other wastes, line the trenches, install
22 legal groundwater monitoring, provide leachate
23 collection, install weather proof caps, and do
24 it now.

4 | 25 The EIS does not address the

52

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TSE-0012 (contd); TSE-0013

4 | 1 interaction of hazardous chemicals such as
2 | 2 carbon tetrachloride, the interaction with the
3 | 3 radioactive chemicals. This is a serious and
4 | 4 fatal flaw in the EIS.

5 | 5 Do not ignore or minimize the
6 | 6 impacts to the groundwater.

6 | 7 You once told us it would take 2000
8 | 8 years for these contaminants to reach the
9 | 9 Columbia River. It didn't. Groundwater, or
10 | 10 water quality, potable water quality, will be a
11 | 11 major issue in the United States within 40
12 | 12 years. It may be a much more serious issue
13 | 13 than energy, which seems to pre-occupy us all
14 | 14 at the present time.

15 | 15 And finally, I regret to say that
16 | 16 you have no credibility. You have contracted
17 | 17 to clean up the Hanford soils by 2018, but you
18 | 18 propose to carry on putting materials in
19 | 19 unlined trenches until the year 2046.

20 | 20 Thank you.

21 | 21 MR. DEE WILLIS: Jim Trumhold.

22 | 22 **TSE-0013** DR. JIM TRUMHOLD: Dr. Jim
23 | 23 Trumhold, Washington Physicians for Social
24 | 24 Responsibility. Now I am here making my own
25 | 25 comment.

TSE-0013 (contd)

1

1 I first would like to concur with
2 Congressman Inslee's read statement and his
3 interest in prohibiting any more waste put in
4 unlined trenches. And the statement that I
5 read from Congressman McDermott, I certainly
6 endorse those thoughts.

2

7 One of the new thoughts in there
8 that should concern us all that talked about
9 the DOE complex possibly producing more nuclear
10 material in terms of weapons, and that would be
11 additional waste streams. But we are not doing
12 well with the waste that we have.

13 And I would second what Dr. Weems
14 said, that it just, when I first heard, the
15 first EIS, and this one, without being a real
16 student of this, or rocket science approach, it
17 seems very basic, maybe a junior high student
18 would say.

3

19 You know, does it seem right if you
20 have most of the nation's nuclear waste in this
21 location, does it make sense, if you don't know
22 exactly what you have in this huge legacy of
23 nuclear waste, it's not accurately
24 characterized, it is in unlined trenches. A
25 very potent and pertinent question is, how can

TSE-0013 (contd)

3

1 you possibly have the luxury of talking about,
2 for political reasons or other reasons, of
3 relieving wastes from other sites?

4 It's not we are not willing to do
5 our share, it's not in our backyard. It is
6 about the health and safety of human beings and
7 the environment to get a handle on what you
8 have, handle on what we have, enough to satisfy
9 at least some of us in the public.

4

10 And incidentally, the DOE people are
11 human beings, and they are part of the public,
12 too. We have a serious present and future
13 public health problem that if they could step
14 forward and say, well, we have adequately
15 characterized it, we have lined the trenches,
16 and we have a national problem, and we need a
17 national dialogue about how we all share that
18 burden nationally, then maybe, and maybe it
19 would be years from now, we'd say we could
20 entertain possibly bringing in some of that if
21 there's a place for it to be handled properly.

5

22 I think it's totally out of the
23 question to be even talking about it until we
24 have done a safe job as far as public health
25 and the environment with what we have.

TSE-0013 (contd); TSE-0014

6

1 So, I think this impact statement
2 should be withdrawn, we should start over, and
3 we should work with what we have there. Thank
4 you.

5 MR. DEE WILLIS: Tina
6 Schulstad.

7 **TSE-0014** MS. TINA SCHULSTAD: Hi. My
8 name is Tina Schulstad, and I am the chair of
9 the Sierra Club's Cascade chapter. I represent
10 26,000 members in Washington state, and we are
11 very concerned with what -- about the current
12 plans for the Hanford Nuclear Reservation.

1

13 Every President wants a legacy, and
14 it seems that President Bush wants his legacy
15 in Washington state to be enlarging our already
16 dangerous Hanford Nuclear Reservation into the
17 nation's toxic waste dump.

18 Since he came into power the
19 administration and top Republicans in Congress
20 have been diligently working to pump new life
21 into the nuclear industry which was a top
22 contributor to their campaigns.

23 This plan threatens our health and
24 our environment here in Washington.

25 To begin, the Bush administration's

56

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TSE-0014 (contd)

1 budget inadequately funded the Tri-Party
2 cleanup agreement in 2002.

3 For 2003 and 2004 we don't know that
4 the funding is adequate because the Department
5 of Energy refused to disclose how it is
6 spending money and what the cost of legally
7 required cleanup work will be by specific
8 project.

9 Ecology and EPA have recently issued
10 a notice of violation letter for the lack of
11 disclosure.

12 Thanks to Senator Patty Murray, the
13 funding levels have increased, but cleanup is
14 still behind schedule and the degree of cleanup
15 is proposed to be drastically cut by the Bush
16 administration's new cleanup goals and Hanford
17 acceleration plans.

18 In the Bush Administration's energy
19 policy which was developed behind closed doors
20 with representatives from the nuclear industry,
21 a high priority was placed on investing in new
22 nuclear capacity.

23 While the administration attempted
24 to paint the technology as new and improved,
25 the real facts are much scarier. We still

57

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TSE-0014 (contd)

1 don't know how to deal with the wastes we
2 already have, and accidents still happen and
3 threaten our public health.

4 Subsidies to create new nuclear
5 plants don't make sense. Soon the Senate
6 Republicans will push a bill that is closely
7 based on the Bush/Chaney plan. The Senate Bill
8 provides 2.4 billion dollars in subsidies over
9 the next five years to support new nuclear
10 plants. They are offering an estimated 14 to
11 16 billion dollars in federal loan guaranties
12 to build seven new plants.

13 As President Bush and Vice-President
14 Cheney aggressively pursue their attempts to
15 resurrect the nuclear industry, they are still
16 woefully ignoring the basic problem: How to
17 safety and securely manage waste that will be
18 around for thousands of years and how to safely
19 and securely transport this waste around our
20 country.

21 The administration and the
22 Department of Energy are attempting to play a
23 shameless shell game with dangerous radioactive
24 waste, and the people of Washington won't play
25 along.

58

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TSE-0014 (contd)

1 We applaud Washington Attorney
2 General Christine Gregoire's efforts to for the
3 Bush administration and the Department of
4 Energy to stick to their promises about
5 cleaning up Hanford.

6 In addition, the Sierra Club and
7 other concerned organizations were recently
8 successful in obtaining a preliminary
9 injunction against the Department of Energy.

2 | 10 The DOE cannot transport anymore of
11 | 11 the highly radioactive, plutonium transuranic
12 | 12 waste to Hanford from other nuclear weapons
13 | 13 plants until it fully considers the risks and
14 | 14 the health and environmental impacts of
15 | 15 trucking the waste to Hanford and storing it at
16 | 16 Hanford.

17 | 17 This Revised Draft EIS fails to
18 | 18 consider those site and route specific risks.
19 | 19 The U.S. Department of Energy does not even
20 | 20 know what is in the highly radioactive remote
21 | 21 handled transuranic waste that it wants to ship
22 | 22 to Hanford. It has designated them
23 | 23 nonverifiable.

4 | 24 Hanford lacks any facility to
25 | 25 analyze the waste as required to meet hazardous

TSE-0014 (contd); TSE-0015

4 | 1 waste laws and to ensure safe storage.
 5 | 2 Accidents, fires and earthquakes will release
 6 | 3 plutonium, chemical, and radioactive wastes in
 7 | 4 waste containers will degrade while stored at
 8 | 5 Hanford for 20 or more years.
 9 | 6 We believe that shipments to Hanford
 10 | 7 should end. The priority for the health of our
 11 | 8 people, fish and rivers is to safely contain
 12 | 9 the ever threatening toxic soup that sloshes
 13 | 10 around the Columbia Basin.
 14 | 11 Focus this EIS on the effort to
 15 | 12 clean up what is already in the soil, rather
 16 | 13 than planning to add more to the nation's worst
 17 | 14 contaminated area.
 18 | 15 Thank you.
 19 | 16 MR. DEE WILLIS: Tina, could
 20 | 17 we have a copy of that?
 21 | 18 MS. TINA SCHULSTAD: Yes.
 22 | 19 MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you.
 23 | 20 Becky Stanley.
 24 | 21 **TSE-0015** MS. BECKY STANLEY: Hi. My
 25 | 22 name is Becky Stanley, and I am a botanist, and
 26 | 23 an activist with the Sierra Club, Cascade
 27 | 24 chapter.
 28 | 25 The Columbia River supported 16

60

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345